

DECONSTRUCTING “STOOPS” IN *SHE STOOPS TO CONQUER* BY OLIVER GOLDSMITH

Agista Nidya Wardani, M.A.

Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang
agista@umm.ac.id

Abstract

This paper aims to give understanding to readers about *She Stoops to Conquer* drama particularly on its varied meaning related to Kate Hardcastle’s demeanors to Charles Marlow as there is no single absolute meaning in every text. To obtain the varied meaning, the writer uses Jacques Derrida’s deconstruction. Deconstruction is useful to look for binary oppositions in the text and to break these binary oppositions in order to get the varied meaning.

The writer finds binary oppositions in the text which explain about Hardcastle’s demeanors to Marlow which are my own manner >< newer fashion, handsome >< beautiful, last >< foremost, be cured >< been threatened, being taught >< unwilling to lay under an obligation, whimsical >< well-looking, modest >< proud, woman of reputation >< barmaid of an inn, public >< private, most virtue >< least, mouths >< bosoms, bashfulness >< confidence, and warm >< cool.

From these binary oppositions, it can be assumed that Hardcastle does not stoop to conquer Marlow, yet roses or remains, instead. Eventhough Hardcastle tries to look modest in front of Marlow, it does not mean that she stoops as she is from an upper-class family. Modesty is Marlow’s criteria of his spouse. Thus, Hardcastle’s demeanor to be modest can be considered as roses to suit herself with Marlow’s criteria or remains to suit herself with Marlow’s criteria. It is because Hardcastle is also modest in certain occasions in which she is asked to do so by her father, Mr.Hardcastle.

Keywords: stoops, conquer, roses, remains, Derrida, deconstruction

In the Age of Johnson, where neoclassicism flourished, genre of dramas that was increasing is comedy of manner. Comedy of manner is a category of plays about the manners and conventions of an aristocratic, highly sophisticated society (Abou-El-Seoud, 2009). One characteristic of comedy of manners is lack of seriousness. Even though it is lack of seriousness, it does not mean that it is worth analyzed.

The reason why it is worth analyzed is that it is a text, while every text does not have single absolute meaning. Evenmore, an odd thing is found in title “She Stoops to Conquer” which does not suit with the text content. The odd thing is on what and how Kate Hardcastle does in front of Charles Marlow in order to attract him. The witer’s assumption is that Hardcastle does not stoop, yet does something else which is more suitable when it is called as the act of rosing or remaining. Thus, a further examination is needed in order to proof this hypothesis on Hardcastle’s demeanors.

Therefore, this paper aims to look for (1) what are binary oppositions in *She Stoops to Conquer* text related to Kate Hardcastle’s demeanors to Charles Marlow; and (2) what is the significance of Kate Hardcastle’s demeanors to Charles Marlow.

The research has two objectives of study. They are general obejective and special objective. The general objective is to give understanding to readers about *She Stoops to Conquer* drama, particularly on its meaning that, in fact, can be varied that *She Stoops to*

Conquer drama has no single absolute meaning. While the special objective is to answer questions have been stated in research question.

This paper focuses to examine hidden meaning in Kate Hardcastle's demeanor to Charles Marlow that might be no one recognizes it previously. The demeanor that the writer means covers Hardcastle's disguise as well as her fabricated attitudes in front of Marlow. To reveal the hidden meaning, the writer uses Derridean deconstruction to look for binary opposition or hierarchical opposition in drama *She Stoops to Conquer* particularly related to Hardcastle's demeanor to Marlow.

In the background of study, the writer has explained that there is no single text that has achieved its complete meaning or final meaning. There is an adjournment in meaning, so that the complete meaning does not exist. In order to open up the meaning of 'stoops', based on what the writer said in research questions and objectives of the study, the writer needs Jacques Derrida's deconstruction. Deconstruction itself is a part of poststructuralism.

Poststructuralism is not a merely pure and independent method of interpretation. It is an extension as well as critique of structuralism. Ferdinand de Saussure believes that language has stable system. Language has three aspects. They are langue, parole, and langage. Langue is an abstract form of how society uses language. Parole is everything uttered by individual as well as the individual's expression that forms the construction of the utterance. Langue is valid only if parole satisfies the principle of language. However, Saussure only focuses his theory on langue as it is impossible to study about parole which is too varied.

Langue is not merely word, yet it is sign. Sign has two important parts that are signifier and signified. Signifier is an impression of sound resulted by speaker, while signified is a concept that is shown by signifier. A sign has a certain mechanism with other signs which is called as difference. Sign emerges as a result of the association of signifier and signified. Sign always depends on other signs which is later called as binary opposition. This Saussurean binary opposition is included in structuralists' structure of paradigmatic methodology. Barthes emphasizes that signifier and signified are needed in structuralism in order to distinguish structuralism from other thoughts.

On Derrida, he does not oppose structuralism, yet he tries to exceeds or even radicalizes structuralism as a strategy of reading a text. Derrida explains that the binary opposition is used as the guide to objectify presence. Derrida argues that Saussurean's binary opposition can lead to the solution of metaphysics of presence. This Derridean method is called as deconstruction. Deconstruction aims to find one thing that is concealed by text and show its grammatical structure.

Derrida considers text as inconsistent. This inconsistency causes paradox in the concept of the text. Derrida refuses presence in text and states that there is no single meaning in text. The presence in text, according to Derrida, preserves hierarchical opposition. Superior term in hierarchical opposition is on presence's and logos' part, while inferior term exists only for reinforcing the status of the superior term and emphasizing its own fall.

In Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer*, logos arises hierarchical opposition in Kate Hardcastle's demeanor. The hierarchical opposition reverses an even breaks it, presence and/or logos is no longer acceptable, and every meaning is postponed (*differance*).

Derrida believes that signifier should be freed from meaning. For him, meaning is always postponed as every text leaves remnant of presence which already disappears. In

differance, any law is based on postponement and distinction. *Differance* always creates infinite possibility in every text by making infinite postponed meaning.

Differance actuates text that looks cold and flat by refunctionating unstable logic that is suppressed by dominant logic (author's logic). Thus, truth, meaning, and reference are not the prominent things that are searched in deconstruction. It is more to a process of searching settled assumptions of text. Being based on how deconstruction works, the writer tries to look for settled assumption of Kate Hardcastle's demeanor reflected in *She Stoops to Conquer* by using deconstruction.

Oliver Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer*, based on the writer's observation, is never read with deconstruction before. Nevertheless, it has been analyzed by using other approaches.

An essay written by James Evans discusses about *She Stoops to Conquer* in terms of the masculinities found in that drama. Evans argues that Oliver Goldsmith tries to create Charles Marlow as a character who has some will for himself as a man linked to his relation with other men and women. Marlow is depicted to be different with other male characters, like his friend, Hastings, Mr. Hardcastle, and Mr. Hardcastle's stepson, Tony Lumpkin. Macaroni which was so famous in the 18th century in British brought ideas of how men should dress. Men should dress in an aristocratic manner, yet according to many contemporaries the ideas that macaroni brought is unmanly and feminized. Marlow's depiction in *She Stoops to Conquer* is quite far from this macaroni look. Even though Marlow is from the upper class, he does not show himself to have a high social status. He does not appear in macaroni. Aside from feminized fashion, Marlow prefers to appear in simple fashion. In line with that, he also likes women who are in simple fashion or modest. The modesty owned by Marlow makes him the modestest person among men in his class. His modesty also brings him into a more adaptable behaviour to lowerclass women rather than upper-class women. It also makes him called by Hastings as an idiot. Another quality of masculinity possessed by Marlow is how he treats Hardcastle when she bursts into tears. He behaves well as a man who can protect woman.

It can be concluded that deconstruction is able to use in this paper as an approach to analyze *She Stoops to Conquer* particularly in relation to Kate Hardcastle's demeanors to Charles Marlow as there is no previous study that examines this work by using Derrida's deconstruction, especially on 'stoops'.

METHOD

Considering the explanations in background of study and theoretical approach, the writer uses deconstruction as the way to examine the text. The examination is done by noticing moments that might not be grasped by common readers. This examination aims to interrogate text, break the stand of the text, and show that there are paired oppositions in the text. The opposition is hierarchical which posits one more superior than the other. The writer, then, shows that the superior one is dependant on the way how it is positioned to the other and show that, in fact, the subordinated one is more prominent.

Systematically, deconstruction consists of three steps. The first step is identifying hierarchical opposition so the superior term can be revealed. The second step is reversing the opposition by showing the interdependance between the opposition or by proposing privilege in reverse. While, the last step is introducing a new term or idea to the old opposition. Thus, deconstruction tries to reveal the fail of the text to draw back itself from any possibility. It also tries to break hierarchical concept that builds the structure of the text

and awaken hidden things that has built the text, so the text does not have complete meaning anymore. Thus, deconstruction that will be used to examine *She Stoops to Conquer* will open a new interpretation.

In the eighteenth century in Britain, marriage was considered important as in most cultures in varied times in the world. There are four basic reasons for getting married in Britain at that time. The first reason is that for social or political consolidation since marriage is a contract between two families concerning on exchange of concrete benefits. The second one is that based on moral, intellectual, and psychological qualities owned by the prospective spouse. The third one is based on physical attraction. This reason usually happened among lower classes for physical courtship among them were common. The fourth one is that based on romantic love that usually ignores some considerations, like money or property (Dobošiová, 2006:8).

Generally, the late of seventeenth and early of eighteenth centuries were times for some changes in rule of marriage. The change moved from the strict to less strict one. Nevertheless, it did not widely happen in aristocratic families. Children are given freer right to choose their spouse. In addition, marriage is no more merely for wealth reason, yet for personal affection as a result of the rise of individualism at that time.

Marriage for personal affection had effects. The dissemination of men and women who are paired was not as evenly as the previous marriage system. The situation led to a desperate matchmaking and men looked for matchmakings in upper classes. Single women were differed according to their financial and social positions. Women with lower income only hoped in a good marriage. Mary Astell, an English feminist, (as cited in Dobošiová, 2006:11) says,

What poor woman is ever taught that she should have a higher design that to get her a husband? Heaven will fall in of course, and if she makes but an obedient and dutiful wife, she cannot miss of it. A husband indeed is thought by both sexes so very valuable, that scarce a man who can keep himself clean and make a bow, but thinks he is good enough to pretend to any woman; no matter for the difference of birth or fortune, a husband is such a wonder-working name as to make an equality, or something more, whatever is obtained (Dobošiová, 2006:11).

In Britain in the eighteenth century, matchmaking was common in order to reach marriage. There are four ways in matchmaking. The first is that the choice totally depends on parents, kin and family friends, and no advice from bride or groom is made. The second is that the choice is made by parent, kin, and family friends, yet children also determine their choice after the decision is made by families. The children determine their choice through one meeting or two meetings among them. The notable thing in this grant given to the children is that it is given more to groom than bride. The third is that the children are free to choose their spouse and the parents are given right of veto. The children choose their spouse based on financial and status of each family. The last one is that the children are free to choose their spouse without any veto from their parents. This way is very rare to happen in the eighteenth century, particularly among upper classes (Dobošiová, 2006:23). In matchmaking, men got more pressure than women since men influence how properties in family will flow, while women were less pressured for they got domestic role that has less direct relation to the family wealth.

From this information on marriage and matchmaking in the 18th century, particularly on how men get more pressure than women in looking for spouse, the writer

assumes that it must be quite hard for men to look for women who fulfill their and their families' criteria. If it is hard for men to look for women, then women must be trying hard to fulfill men's criteria. They must rise themselves in order to be able to fulfill the criteria in order to be chosen by men. This assumption is linked to, be explored, and be proven in the next part with the use of Derridean deconstruction.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Previously, it has been presented the information about marriage and matchmaking in the eighteenth century. From that information, the writer assumes that women at that time must rise themselves in order to be able to fulfill the criteria to be chosen by men. This assumption is notably related to Kate Hardcastle's demeanors to Charles Marlow. Thus, the paper discusses and tries to reveal the hidden meaning of Kate Hardcastle's demeanor to Charles Marlow.

Hardcastle acts to be a barmaid of 'the inn' where Marlow and Hastings aim to stay in after they are befooled by Lumpkin. 'The inn' is actually Mr. Hardcastle's house where both Marlow and Hastings actually intend to visit. Mr. Hardcastle is an upper-class man whose daughter, Kate Hardcastle, is surely an upper-class woman, too. Hardcastle likes a man who has certain qualities or characteristics, among of which are modest in terms of his appearance as well as characteristic, and friendly and less formal in term of his way of expressing something¹. As Hardcastle meets Marlow, she feels that Marlow fits for her since Marlow fulfills her requirements of becoming her spouse. On the other hand, Marlow likes women who are modest, too. He tends to be easily intimate with lower-class women. Considering these facts about Marlow and her, Hardcastle tries to attract Marlow by appearing in a modest dress and behaving unpretentiously. Thus, Goldsmith entitles his drama "She Stoops to Conquer". The word "stoops" means that Hardcastle makes an attempt to dress quite far-low than she usually appears in front of Marlow in order to make Marlow fall in love with her. Nevertheless, this Hardcastle's demeanors to Marlow has *difference*. It means that Hardcastle's demeanors do not always mean that she stoops to conquer Marlow. It might have another meaning. The meaning of those demeanors are postponed in order to obtain another probable meaning.

To find another probable meaning, the writer uses deconstruction as have been explained. Deconstruction looks for binary oppositions contained in *She Stoops to Conquer* text and then breaks them. The breaking of these binary opposition is essential since it functions to omit the old thought that is resulted by the hierarchical opposition and substitutes it with another probable new thought or meaning.

In *She Stoops to Conquer* text, there are some binary oppositions. They are, dress in my own manner (220) >< newer fashion (221), handsome (221) >< beautiful (227), last (222) >< foremost (222), be cured (222) >< been threatened (222), being taught (222) >< unwilling to lay under an obligation (226), whimsical (222) >< well-looking (222), modest (232) >< proud (222), woman of reputation (232) >< barmaid of an inn (232), public (243) >< private (243), most virtue (243) >< least (243), mouths (243) >< bosoms (243), bashfulness (244) >< confidence (244), and warm (233) >< cool (233).

Each of these binary oppositions has meanings that direct to new significances other than the old significance that is Hardcastle stoops to conquer Marlow. The binary opposition

¹ Oliver Goldsmith, *Poems and Plays* (London: J.M.Dent&Sons Ltd., 1910), p.220-221.

of dress in my own manner (220) >< newer fashion (221) that is written in *She Stoops to Conquer* text

Miss Hard. You allow me the morning to receive and pay visits, and to dress in my own manner; and in the evening, I put on my housewife's dress, to please you.²

Miss Hard. My dear papa, why will you mortify one so?— Well, if he refuses, instead of breaking my heart at his indifference, I'll only break my glass for its flattery. Set my cap to some newer fashion, and look out for some less difficult admirer³ shows that in order to meet Marlow, Hardcastle only needs to dress in her own manner. To please Marlow, Hardcastle does not need to dress in a rich-look. Nevertheless, Hardcastle assumes that if only Marlow is difficult to be conquered, she will look for another man who is less difficult. Her assumption emphasizes us that no higher or lower act are needed to attract Marlow, yet she only needs appears as the way she is. In other words, Hardcastle does not need to stoop to conquer Marlow.

The next binary opposition is, handsome (221) >< beautiful (227). It is written in the text,

Hard. Young and brave.

Miss Hard. I'm sure I shall like him.

Hard. And very handsome.

Miss Hard. My dear papa, say no more (*kissing his hand*), he's mine, I'll have him!⁴

Marlow. Our information differs in this. The daughter is said to be well-bred and beautiful...⁵

Mr. Hardcastle explains to Hardcastle that Marlow is a handsome man. This explanation makes Hardcastle eagers to own Marlow. The eagerness of owning the beloved man is genuine. Logically, if someone tries to attracts someone who s/he loves, s/he will do something to fulfill the beloved one's criteria of her/his spouse. To fulfill means to rose her/himself to be the one who is wanted by the beloved one. Thus, it is impossible that Hardcastle's demeanors in front of Marlow is considered as stooping instead of rosing. Whatever Hardcastle tries to change in order to conquer Marlow, it is always

²*Ibid.*, p.220.

³*Ibid.*, p.221.

⁴*Ibid.*, p.221.

⁵*Ibid.*, p.227.

called as the act of rosing. In addition, the information Marlow got from his father that Hardcastle is beautiful, makes Marlow interested in her. There is no way for Hardcastle to conquer Marlow by stooping as she is already attractive to Marlow.

The following binary opposition is, last (222) >< foremost (222). It is written in the text,
Miss Hard. Lud, this news of papa's puts me all in a flutter. Young, handsome; these he put last; but I put them foremost.⁶

Hardcastle's concern that puts the characteristics of young and handsome foremost indicates that she has a big eagerness to get Marlow. In the initial explanation, the writer has argued that someone who falls in love will do anything to fulfill her/his beloved one's criteria of spouse. In addition, it has been stated that the act of fulfilling is equal to the act of rosing. Evenmore, Hardcastle gives an emphasis to her eagerness with the word 'foremost'.

Be cured (222) >< been threatened (222) is the next binary opposition that is present in *She Stoops to Conquer* text.

Miss Hard. Sensible, good-natur'd; I like all that. But then reserved, and sheepish, that's much against him. Yet can't he be cured of his timidity, by being taught to be proud of his wife.

Miss Hard. No; nothing of all this. I have been threatened—I can scarce get it out—I have been threatened with a lover!⁷

In this binary opposition, a slight paradox is obviously seen. In one side, Hardcastle is willing to cure Marlow's timidity. The act of curing indicates that Hardcastle is superior than Marlow in term of her nature of being confident. On the other hand, she is threatened by the state of loving Marlow. The state of becoming threatened shows that Hardcastle is inferior than Marlow in term of inducing the feel of love. From these two contradictory findings, it can be assumed that Hardcastle's position toward Marlow's is ordinary. She can be superior and inferior at the same time. Hardcastle's demeanors in order to get Marlow is, however, dependent to this state. Thus, it can be assumed that Hardcastles' acts to get Marlow is not totally stooping. There is probability that Hardcastle is rosing or even remaining the same as what she actually is.

The next binary opposition is, being taught (222) >< unwilling to lay under an obligation (226). In the text, it is written,

Miss Hard. Yet can't he be cured of his timidity; by being taught to be proud of his wife.⁸

Marlow. I own, Hastings, I am unwilling to lay myself under an obligation to every one I meet...⁹

There is a clash in these two statements coming from Hardcastle and Marlow. Hardcastle is willing to teach Marlow how to be confident, while Marlow does not like to obey whoever he meets. From these statements, it can be assumed that both Hardcastle and Marlow are superior. What makes it interesting is that when Hardcastle and Marlow are superior or owning strong characteristic, it is impossible for Hardcastle to stoop in order to conquer

⁶*Ibid.*, p.222.

⁷*Ibid.*, p.222.

⁸*Ibid.*, p.222.

⁹ p.226.

Marlow. In addition, the word “being taught” does not show that Hardcastle is willing to stoop.

The coming binary opposition is, whimsical (222) >< well-looking (222). The binary opposition is present in the text as follows,

Miss Hard. Tell me, Constance, how do I look this evening? Is there anything whimsical about me? Is it one of my well-looking days, child?¹⁰

The questions asked by Hardcastle to her friend, Neville, shows that she is willing to look good in front of

Marlow. She tries to dress well and not to look whimsical. It is done in order to attract Marlow. The thing that needs to notice here is that Hardcastle does not try to appear modestly, yet improves her appearance. The act of improving her appearance does not show that she tries to stoop at all.

The later binary opposition is, modest (232) >< proud (222). It is stated in the text, *Marlow.* An impudent fellow may counterfeit modesty, but I’ll be hanged if a modest man can ever counterfeit impudence.¹¹

Miss Hard. Yet can’t he be cured of his timidity, by being taught t be proud of his wife.¹²

From this quotation, it is known that Marlow’s nature is timid. Due to Marlow’s timidity, Hardcastle tries to teach him to be confident. The willingness to teach Marlow shows that Hardcastle is superior and willing to be superior than Marlow. Thus, it is not proven that Hardcastle stoops to conquer Marlow.

The next binary opposition that becomes the most notable among other binary oppositions is, woman of reputation (232) >< barmaid of an inn (232). It is the most notable binary opposition because it obviously shows Hardcastle’s disguise to Marlow in order to get him.

Hastings. But in the company of women of reputation I never saw such an idiot, such a trembler... *Hastings.* If you could but say half the fine things to them that I have heard you lavish upon the barmaid of an inn, or even a college bedmaker.¹³

‘Woman of reputation’ means that Hardcastle comes from an upper-class family, while ‘barmaid of an inn’ is her disguise in order to look modest in front of Marlow. Eventhough Hardcastle tries to appear less luxurious, her act cannot be considered as stooping. It is because her act is for fulfilling Marlow’s criteria of spouse. When Hardcastle fulfills Marlow’s criteria of spouse, it means that Hardcastle roses herself in order to be accepted by Marlow.

The following binary opposition written in *She Stoops to Conquer* is, public (243) >< private (243).

Miss Hard. You mean that in this hypocritical age there are few that do not condemn in public what they practise in private, and think they pay every debt to virtue when they praise it.¹⁴

10p.222.

11/ibid.,p.232.

12/ibid.,p.222.

13/ibid.,p.232.

14 p.243.

This citation is a piece of dialogue between Hardcastle and Marlow. They are talking about themselves and their acts to observe each other. Both Hardcastle and Marlow agree that they should show their real. They do not like hypocrisy. They do not like to show something in public and private differently. They like to be honest to people around them. Nevertheless, by saying this, Hardcastle is lying. What she shows in front of Marlow, a new acquaintance for her that means public for her, is a lie. This lie aims to make as if she is the one who suits Marlow. In fact, in private, she is not a person who suits Marlow. Thus, it can be assumed that Hardcastle tries to rose herself in order to suits with Marlow's criteria of spouse.

The coming binary oppositions are, most virtue (243) >< least (243) and mouths (243) >< bosoms (243). These two binary oppositions are explained together since they are related to each other. *Marlow*. True, madam; those who have most virtue in their mouths, have least of it in their bosoms. But I'm sure I tire you, madam.¹⁵

This part of dialogue between Hardcastle and Marlow still talks about dislikeness of hypocrisy. Marlow believes that people who are good only in their mouths, they are bad in their hearts. Ironically, his statement is contradictory with what Hardcastle does to him and he does not realize it. The hypocrisy done by Hardcastle is for rosing herself in front of Marlow that in fact makes her despicable.

The next binary opposition is, bashfulness (244) >< confidence (244). It is written *Miss Hard*. Ha! ha! ha! was there ever such a sober sentimental interview? I'm certain he scarce looked in my face the whole time. Yet the fellow, but for his unaccountable bashfulness, is pretty well, too. He has good sense, but then so buried in his fears, that it fatigues one more than ignorance. If I could teach him a little confidence, it would be doing somebody that I know of a piece of service. But who is that somebody?—that, is a question I can scarce answer.¹⁶

This binary opposition is quite the same as what has been explained before about Marlow's shyness. The word 'bashfulness' represents Marlow, while the word 'confidence' represents Hardcastle and what she is willing to teach Marlow about. These two characteristics show Hardcastle's superiority and Marlow's inferiority. In addition, Hardcastle's act of willing to teach Marlow indicates that she admits that she is superior than Marlow. Therefore, it can be assumed that Hardcastle roses herself instead of stoops herself.

The coming binary opposition is, warm (233) >< cool (233). These words are said by Hastings.

Hastings. I'm surprised that one who is so warm a friend can be so cool a lover.¹⁷

Hasting's statement shows that Marlow is actually a warm person, yet he is not that warm when he deals with love. Marlow finds difficulty to interact with upper-class women. He is more comfortable with lower-class women. This situation is taken advantage by Hardcastle. She tries to look like a lower-class woman in order to attract Marlow. Eventhough she tries to look like a lower-class woman, it does not mean that she stoops to conquer Marlow.

¹⁵p.243.

¹⁶ p.244.

¹⁷p.233.

Contrary to that, she tries to fulfill Marlow's criteria of spouse, in other words, she rises herself in order to be the same as what Marlow wants.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the examination that has been explained in the previous part, a conclusion can be drawn about Hardcastle's demeanors in front of Marlow in *She Stoops to Conquer*. The title "She Stoop to Conquer" indicates that Hardcastle stoops to conquer Marlow by appearing like a lower-class woman. Whereas, the thirteen binary oppositions found in the text show that Hardcastle does not stoop, but rises or remains instead. It is because Hardcastle tries to fulfill Marlow's criteria of spouse. When she tries to fulfill the criteria, it means that she rises herself in order to suit with those criteria although she acts as if she is from a lower class, in fact, she is from an upper class. To act less than usual does not always mean to stoop. In Hardcastle's context, to act less than usual means to rise because it is an effort to fit with who she wants. In addition, as Mr. Hardcastle sometimes asks Hardcastle to dress modestly, it means that Hardcastle is used to appear modestly. Thus, her modesty in front of Marlow does not mean that she stoops, but remains.

REFERENCES

- Abou-El-Seoud, E., (2009). *Literary Movements for Students, Second Edition*. Gale Cengage Learning.
- Dobošiová, M. (2006). *Marriage and Human Relationships in the Eighteenth-century Britain*. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Evans, J. (2011). "The Dullissimo Maccaroni": Masculinities in *She Stoops to Conquer*, *Philological Quarterly*. 90.1. Retrieved from <http://www.libres.uncg.edu>
- Goldsmith, O. (1910). *Poems and Plays*. London: J.M.Dent&Sons Ltd.